7504

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. IX, No. 1 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | January 15, 1979

Scientific Magazines Bursting Out All Over

Why it's happening and how long it's going to last we cannot say, but there is remarkable boom underway in selling news of science to the general public.

First off, Penthouse Publications came out last September with *Omni,* a slick monthly that it describes as a magazine "of science and science fiction." Selling on newsstands for $2 per copy, *Omni* got off to a fast start—with nearly one million sales of its first issue; subsequent issues are said to be selling at an even faster pace. The "science and science fiction" formula initially aroused some skepticism in establishment scientific circles, but apparently it's okay: Philip Handler, President of the National Academy of Sciences, has declared, in writing, that "*Omni* is handsome and attractive, esthetically and intellectually."

Omni's debut was soon followed by the long-planned, but strike-delayed, startup of a weekly science section as a regular part of the *New York Times.* Appearing on Tuesdays, *Science Times* reads like a collection of science, medicine, and education articles that didn't make the daily news section. The science section has not won any bravos in the science-writing fraternity, nor have we come across any scientists who are overly impressed with it. But, SGR's own assessment is that, after a weak start, *Science Times* has been consistently improving. What it obviously needs, however, are writers who regard it as their prime outlet, rather than as a repository for leftovers from daily journalism.

Health Research Principles: The HEW Saga Goes on---Page 2

Next, there's a new magazine gestating at the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Titled *Science 79* (the number will change with each year), the magazine was proposed to the AAAS by Allen L. Hammond, the longtime head of *Science's* Research News section. Hammond was recently detached from that post—since taken over by Barbara J. Culliton, who will also continue as editor of the *Science* News and Comment section—so that he can devote fulltime to the proposed magazine, which is mainly intended for a well-educated, non-scientist audience interested in science. The AAAS Board has not yet given a final "go" signal for the new editorial venture, but it has put up money for a series of marketing tests, and it is generally believed that the project has advanced to the point where it is nearly certain to go ahead to fullscale publication.

The only cloud on the AAAS's publishing horizon is one that recently appeared—wearing a Time Inc. label. The big publishing conglomerate has announced that it is planning hard for a new monthly science magazine, and that it expects to have a prototype issue out in the Spring. What's involved here are relatively boundless resources—Time Inc., for example, bankrolled *Sports Illustrated* for years before it turned profitable, and it's committed to putting $60 million into its recently acquired *Washington Star.* Since Time and the AAAS would be fishing the same waters for readers, the conglomerate's interest in the science field is no source of joy for backers of the AAAS venture.

On the other hand, it must also be noted that inside the AAAS bureaucracy, there are those who would weep only briefly, if at all, were the proposed *Science*

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Final pre-publication scoop on the FY '80 budget, which will be made public January 22: Basic research will get a boost—something between 4-5 per cent above the anticipated inflation rate. Carter will take further cuts at R&D demonstration projects, and will hold spending on development more or less steady.

Senator William (Golden Fleece) Proxmire is not yet off the hook for the abusive language that he employed when he gave his publicity-seeking award to Ronald W. Hutchinson, a NASA-supported researcher, in 1975. Sued by Hutchinson for $8 million, Proxmire won in the lower courts on the grounds that the researcher was a public figure and, therefore, was a proper object for public comment by the Senator. Last week, the Supreme Court agreed to hear Hutchinson's appeal.

That was a tough attack on the ridiculers of research that NSF Director Richard Atkinson was to deliver at the Indiana University in November—and SGR, upon receiving a text from NSF, was pleased to reprint a big chunk of the talk in Vol. VIII, No. 21. We are now advised by an NSF spokesman that the text was merely a draft, that it was "inadvertently" sent to us, and, "As it turned out, the Director gave another speech." Too bad. The non-delivered speech was his best to date.

HEW Slogs on in Quest for Research Principles

Since SGR's renown is, in large part, based on its formidable capacity for down-to-the-bone exegesis of government science-policy documents, it is with no little reluctance that we must concede an encounter with an impenetrable document.

The prose production to which we refer bears the title of the "Conference Report" of the "National Conference on Health Research Principles," which event occurred last October 3 and 4, and was duly reported on in our issue of October 15.

As will be recalled by the few who, for one reason or another, are doomed to keep up with such matters, the Conference on Health Research Principles was inspired by HEW Secretary Joseph A. Califano Jr., for the purpose, as was recounted in one of the Conference's innumerable papers, of devising principles which would lead to a strategy which would then lead to a 5-year health-research budget. (Since we cannot doubt that our lucid paraphrase invites suspicion concerning our reliability, we quote, from the Conference Report, a preparatory document for the Conference itself: "The principles are intended to serve as a structure for the subsequent development of a strategy to guide the allocation of limited Federal research dollars and to influence the manner in which the DHEW will carry out its health research activities." Having successfully defended our credibility, we return to the main theme.)

Now, the Conference, which generated, we figure, at least 4000 person-days of semi-idleness, was called for the purpose of collecting comments on a preliminary set of principles that had originated with the various health-related agencies within the HEW empire. (Please pay attention!)

After the Conference was over, chairmen of various panels put together these comments—many of them hostile to the underlying principles of the Conference—and the comments were turned over to the Conference staff, which then used them to revise the principles. The newly issued Conference Report contains masses of the aforementioned documents, including the revised draft principles, plus an "overview statement by NIH Director Donald Fredrickson, who has patiently presided over this Califano extravaganza with astonishing equanimity.

States the NIH Director, who is known for careful selection of his words: "The revised principles are subjective and uneven. They are in need of further refinement, reordering, and transmutation to goals—the next phase in the process which the Secretary [Califano] announced should be completed by next spring. The principles are, however, a more thoughtful

(Continued on Page 3)

. . . CBS Has Science TV Show in the Works

(Continued from Page 1)

79 to be aborted. Moribund as ever, the AAAS does not take easily to new ventures, and there is no dearth of whispers there about how ongoing activities might suffer from the allocation of resources to a new-born enterprise.

The list of new editorial interest in science also includes the British weekly *The Economist,* which recently inaugurated a regular science and technology section, usually of three to four pages. Keyed mainly to industrial high-technology, the section traces back to readership surveys in which science and technology were most often cited as serious lacks in the journal's worldwide coverage.

Finally, CBS TV is at work on a pilot of a 30-minute science show that's modeled after its fabulously successful *60 Minutes.* Completion is scheduled for the spring, but what happens then is far from certain, given the turbulence that regularly afflicts TV programming.

Why the sudden burst of interest in what amounts, after all, to translating science for lay audiences? There is no sure way of knowing, and, of course, the durability remains to be seen. But one clue is that magazine publishing, in general, is booming, apparently in response to lessening interest in television, which has experienced some dropoff of audience in the last year or so.

Another factor is that science-related magazines represent something of an open frontier for the restless magazine trade. Just about everything else—from tennis to money management—has been exploited in specialized magazines, but publishers have been wary of science, thinking, perhaps, that the field is dominated by *Scientific American, Science, Science News.* Now, on the basis of market surveys, they have become persuaded that there's money to be made in new scientific publications—which the *Omni* experience seems to verify.

It may be speculated that the readership is coming from a post-Sputnik generation that received exposure to beefed-up education programs in high school and college. Or, it may be that orthodox science possesses a rationality that is increasingly appealing in an era of transient, kooky fad explanations of the world.—DSG

. . . Fredrickson Sees Aversion to Austerity

(Continued from Page 2)

and valuable beginning than many observers expected. They reflect *angst* of different kinds: that fundamental research not be sacrificed to expediency, that access to scientific help not be denied any of the health missions, that an essential pluralism of health sciences not be stifled by monolithic creations, or that budget displacements not substitute for skillful management rearrangements designed to assure effective interaction and collective responsibility among the health agencies.

"Some of the panels," Fredrickson continued, "were reluctant to accept as given the concept of austerity—the requirement that any change be met through fiscal redeployment. However, this reluctance was accompanied by reasoned arguments on what alternative sources the commentator would use."

Now and then a bit of policy can be glimpsed through the otherwise unrelieved opacity, as, for example, when Fredrickson notes that "On the important issue of creating knowledge to meet the needs of regulators, the Panels, while not endorsing the concept of 'mission-oriented fundamental research,' did nevertheless support the need for effective capability in each agency to conduct research aimed at its immediate needs."

From sources associated with the NIH high command, we are reliably advised that what all that amounts to is a turndown of a scream for help by the Food and Drug Administration.

In any case, the Health Research Principles minuet is scheduled to go on for some time, and may even, as suggested by Fredrickson's remarks, become a mini-industry in its own right. However, as we have observed on a number of other occasions, its durability is tightly linked to Califano's tenure as HEW Secretary, which could be short or might, looking to the foreseeable maximum possibilities, stretch on for another six years, though that is doubtful.

The timetable for the further refinement of the Principles calls for the Institute of Medicine to produce a critique by the end of this month. Meanwhile, copies of the report on the National Conference on Health Research Principles are available, without charge, from: Kurt Habel, Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, Building 1, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. 20014.

Back Volumes of SGR

A note to librarians and other collectors:

On the occasion of SGR commencing, with this issue, its ninth year of publication, we take note of occasional inquiries about complete sets of back volumes. We have a limited supply, dating back to Volume I (1971); also, we have in stock individual copies of each issue.

For additional information: SGR, P.O. Box 6226, Washington, D.C. 20015.

In Print

Following are some recent publications likely to be of interest to SGR readers:

"Social Assessment of Technology—A Review of Selected Studies," published by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; comprises 15 recently published studies "devoted to the evaluation of the experience of OECD Member countries in the area of social assessment of technology." (290 pages, $15, available from OECD's worldwide network of sales offices). In the US: OECD, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Washington, DC 20006. Tel (202) 724-1857.

"Private Foundation Health Expenditures: A Survey Analysis," a 75-page examination of health-related philanthropy, prepared by the Health Policy Research Group, Georgetown University School of Medicine, 2233 Wisconsin Ave. N.W., Suite 525, Washington, DC 20007. (A very limited number of copies is available, without charge, from the research group; ample supplies will be available from the National Technical Information Service in two or three months.)

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1979

ISSN 0048-9581

Contributing Editor
Anne Roark

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

European Correspondents
Michael Kenward (London)
Francois Seguier (Paris)

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $84.50 (two years, $149.50); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Industrial R&D: Familiarity Breeds Decline

The following is from "Support of Basic Research by Industry," a report issued in December by the National Science Foundation:

By far, the most frequently articulated reason for the proportional decrease of basic research in industrial R&D budgets was simply the fact that top management now understands the strategic role of research much more than they did in the past—and with this increased understanding came increased control. The "chain of events" behind this evolution is fairly easy to trace.

In the 1950s, the faith validity attributed to science and scientific research was at an all-time high. Management felt that they had to do basic and fundamental research—and they were proud to *support* it. On the other hand, management did not understand the scientist or the scientific process. Consequently, they did not *manage* it. They built little universities, followed the "Bell Labs" or "black box" model and expected great things to happen. In general, great things did not happen and both top management and R&D management now know that if the industrial research function is treated that way, very little will happen.

Thus, in the mid-1960s, the industrial research process was evolving into a corporate function with a goal-directed emphasis. There was also a new group of R&D managers who were more knowledgeable and willing to implement this strategy. Concomitantly, new organizational forms for managing large-scale development efforts were becoming available (mainly from the interactions among industry and government). Control, formality in project selection, and the expectation of business-related short term results became the dominant theme.

However . . . when the pendulum swung, it swung too far. This overreaction had some effects that will take many years to reverse. First, it had a bad effect on the amount of scientific talent who wanted to work in industry, and, secondly, it worked to eliminate many high-risk, long-range, fundamental, etc., efforts that could still be goal-directed and possibly beneficial. . .

("Support of Basic Research by Industry," 55 pages, is available without charge from the Division of Science Resources Studies, National Science Foundation, 1800 G St. N.W., Washington, DC 20550.)

Britain: A Surprise Boost for R&D Budgets

London. A Christmas bonus of about $95 million came as something of a surprise to Britain's research community. In mid-December, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, Shirley Williams, told the House of Commons that over the next four years the country's five research councils (RCs) would get that increase above what the government had stated in last January's five-year forecast.

This injection of extra funds adds a little over 4 per cent to what is known as the Science Budget. In the 1979/80 financial year, the five RCs will now receive $19 million more than was originally intended, giving them a total budget of $520 million. The shareout of next year's Science Budget will be as follows: Agricultural Research Council, $48 million; Medical RC, $90 million; Natural Environment RC, $60 million; Science RC, $292 million, and the Social Science RC, $29 million. (In all the British government spends around $2.4 billion on R&D by the RCs and the various research establishments run by government departments.)

The biggest beneficiary from the new guidelines for the RCs' future budgets will be the Science Research Council (SRC). Not only will the SRC's budget be nearly $8 million higher than expected next year, but also it can look forward to the day, in four years time, when its budget comes to the end of a period of decline. Over the past five years the SRC has lost money to the other RCs as the government has reordered its R&D priorities.

The SRC is responsible for basic research in astronomy, the biological sciences, chemistry, engineering, mathematics, and physics. For a decade the SRC's budget has grown more slowly then those of the other RC's. And when the world economic crisis hit Britain and the government cut back on its spending, the SRC's funds were harder hit than most. Only last January, when the worst of the financial slump was over and other RCs were told to plan for rising budgets, the SRC was warned that its budget would fall by 1.7 per cent a year over the five years of the forecast.

For some time now the chairman of the SRC has complained about the council's budget and this led to temporary respites. When the government wanted to boost the economy by spreading some money around earlier last year it decided to peg the SRC's budget at the same level as it had been in the previous year, but it was warned to plan for a 1 per cent cut in the coming

(Continued on Page 5)

. . . UK Aims to Reverse Science Decline

(Continued From Page 4)

year, 1979/80. The extra $8 million for 1979/80 has more than wiped out this decline, and the projected fall of 1.7 per cent a year for the period up to 1982-83 has been put aside. The SRC has been told to plan for a decrease of 1 per cent in 1980/81, and .5 per cent in 1981/82—after that it will, like the ARC, MRC, and NERC, see its funding rise by 1 per cent a year. Only the Social Science RC will stick to a "zero-growth" budget for the foreseeable future, perhaps reflecting a disenchantment with this area of activity.

The new budgetary guidelines for research in universities and the RC's own establishments came just a month after the new chairman of the SRC, Professor Geoffrey Allen, complained that the SRC has done all it can to cut back on space research and nuclear physics.

These areas have been squeezed from two directions. To begin with they have been hit by the SRC's fall from favor in the Science Budget. On top of this, just as the government has boosted the RCs whose work has a more obvious immediate relevance to Britain's industrial and social needs, the SRC has been switching funds from these areas of esoteric physics into more down-to-earth areas such as engineering R&D.

The fall in physics has been such that Britain now no longer has its own experimental facilities for high energy physics—the last accelerator was shut down in the middle of 1978—leaving the country's physicists to rely on the European Organization for Nuclear Research, CERN, in Switzerland. (Last year 17 per cent of the SRC's money went to CERN.) And Britain abandoned its own space program and joined the European effort years ago.

In its annual review for 1977/78, the SRC warned that after 1981 it "will not be able to make further savings in the nuclear physics and space areas to finance the continued expansion necessary in the areas of the Engineering and Science Boards." And for a change the research community seems to sympathize with the physicists—not long ago the common cry was that high-energy physics was taking far more than its fair share of the funds available for science—and it seems to have been widely accepted that if further cuts are made into these two areas, Britain might as well give them up altogether.

Instead of just complaining about how much money the government was slashing off its budget, the SRC took a more constructive approach. It asked its research boards how much they thought they needed to do their work properly. What could have been an invitation to indulge in wishful thinking actually produced some fairly modest requests. And the SRC passed its message on to the government: "After allowing for all the savings achieved by the closure of both domestic high-energy accelerators and the run-down of the national rocket and satellite programs, the Council advised the Department of Education and Science that the SRC program needed to sustain standards of education and research would by 1982/83 require expenditure of about the same level as in 1976/77—i.e. about 2 per cent greater than the current budget in 1977/78."

Shirley Williams's announcement means that the SRC's budget will not be very far from this target. And it is very likely that Williams was delighted by the SRC's documented case, for it has been rumored that she was more than happy to increase the Science Budget, but that the Cabinet was lukewarm about the idea.

Given this budget, said the SRC, the amount spent on engineering would rise from 15 per cent of the budget in 1977/78, to 21 per cent in 1982/83. Over the same period the share going to the nuclear physics board would fall from 35 per cent to 26 per cent.

When Shirley Williams announced the increased Science Budget just before Christmas, she said that the extra money "will make it possible to exploit a wide range of opportunities for advance in, for example, engineering (including microelectronics) and in the other areas supported by the Science Research Council which helps to maintain our national scientific capability and contribute to developments in industry; studies relevant to cancer and brain disorders; geological programs with potential for energy and mineral resources; and agricultural research with potential for higher crop yields. It will also benefit the training of postgraduate students and provide greater scope for promising young scientists."

Unfortunately the educational goal may not be so easily achieved. The RCs are only one part of the equation. The country's universities receive money from the RCs for particular research projects, but the money to maintain the universities and to staff them comes from the University Grants Committee. Without more money for the UGC it seems unlikely that the universities will be able to do anything about the stagnation that has hit most faculties. (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 21).—MK

Medical Enrollments at Peak

Medical school enrollments hit a new high last year —62,242 students—a four per cent increase over the previous year. The freshman class was a record one, 16,530, two per cent above last year's. The percentage of women students rose from 23.7 to 24.3, but minority students declined, from 9 to 8.7 per cent of enrollments.

UN Conference: Scientists Feel Cheerier

When the United Nations decided several years ago that its 1979 Conference on Science and Technology for Development (UNCSTD) would be a conference of government officials—rather than scientists—there were a lot of ruffled egos in the scientific community. Today, however, tempers have subsided and some members of the US scientific community are even expressing a bit of optimism about the conference, scheduled for August 20-31, in Vienna.

Two years in the planning stages, UNCSTD follows a long series of UN conferences on world hunger, population control, women's rights, and various other subjects—all of which are supposed to provide a foundation for the Vienna meeting's subject: the application of science and technology for the improvement of living standards and economic growth in the developing nations.

From the beginning, the Secretary General of the Conference, Joao da Costa, of Brazil, has stressed his desire to make the conference effective—in the sense that it will lead to governments doing something. And, in this connection, there have been frequent and unkind references to the UN's 1963 Science and Technology Conference, in Geneva—a scientist-dominated affair—that produced a lot of collegial chit-chat, but not much else.

Reasoning that it is politicians, not scientists, who run governments, da Costa organized the 1979 conference as an official government-to-government meeting. The inevitable result has been that some members of the US scientific community have felt slighted, though they couch their disappointment in terms of disinterested concern about the wisdom of da Costa's approach.

"The fact that the conference is on science and technology makes it a little awkward to focus on straight government-to-government negotiations," says William D. Carey, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. "Government is only one of three partners in a market economy . . .There is also industry as well higher education."

Speaking at the annual meeting of AAAS in Houston last week, Carey warned that his expectations about the Vienna meeting were not "euphoric." "But," he added, "neither do I anticipate as much of a disaster as appeared to be on the menu a year ago."

Why the change of heart?

For one thing, explains Emilio Q. Daddario, chairman of the AAAS, the preparations for the meeting have not ignored scientists' views to the extent many had feared. Following a recent meeting in New Delhi (one of many in preparation for UNCSTD) Daddario said he was "encouraged" by the "considerable thought" that was being given to the practical questions of how sophisticated technology could be adapted to the developing nations' needs. That, of course, was the idea UN officials had in mind when they insisted that each of the UN's 150 member countries spend two years planning for the conference.

During the two-year period, countries were to assess their scientific and technological experiences, potential, and goals. National papers describing those policies were to have been submitted to the Secretary General's office last May. However, when it became clear that few countries would meet the deadline, it was postponed until August.

So far, UN officials say, they have been reasonably pleased, although hardly surprised, by the papers the developing countries submitted. Their proposals, which have been published by the Secretary General's office in a draft "plan of action" for the conference, range from requests for greater cooperation to demands for whole new educational systems. Some papers have asked the industrialized countries of the North to set aside portions of their gross national product for research related to the problems of development in the South. Others have called for codes of conduct covering the transfer of technology and the behavior of multinational corporations.

The papers prepared by the Western powers have not been so straightforward, however. Britain's document, for example, has been criticized by the British press as being "primarily a reiteration of good works"—a tactic expressly forbidden by da Costa when he set out the game rules for the conference two years ago. The US, on the other hand, has not even officially released its document, and is not scheduled to do so until next week.

Although the delay has troubled many scientists, it has surprised few of them. The problem, the critics agree, is that despite the motions of setting up a planning office in the State Department and appointing a new Ambassador the US has never had any clear-cut policy concerning scientific development in the so-called third and fourth worlds.

After all, critics point out, it was not until after the Arab oil embargo ended in 1974 that the US even began to take seriously the demands of the "New Economic Order" which the less developed nations had set forth so vehemently in the early 1970's.

That indifference, scientists say, simply has aggravated the already numerous problems of planning a conference for politicians, rather than scientists. Indeed, the State Department officials in charge of planning for the conference admit they have been pre-

(Continued on Page 7)

. . . Details Due Soon on New Aid Foundation

(Continued from Page 6)

occupied with seeing that the US can stay out of the line of fire in any potential political eruption between "have" nations of the North and the "have-nots" of the South.

Although they are reluctant to say so openly, some US officials admit privately they are banking on one US initiative to keep them out of difficulty. The proposal, announced by President Carter in Venezeula last March, is to create a Foundation for International Technological Cooperation (FITC)—as part of the Agency for International Development. It would, scientists hope, boost development-related science and technology, as well as encourage cooperation between US institutions and those of developing countries.

Without saying why, the White House for several months now has delayed getting out Presidential Review Memorandum 33, the document which should spell out the details of the FITC proposal—when it will come into existence, who will operate it, and perhaps most important of all, how much will be spent on it. In the meantime, Sen. Adlai E. Stevenson (D-Ill.) has plans to introduce his own proposal for a foundation which would be independent from existing foreign-aid programs.

What is now needed, some say, is a new system of awards—both monetary and honorary—which would give researchers and educators the prestige and credit required to get more talent committed to helping the needy.

Although it's too soon to tell what the outcome will be, what gives many scientists as much hope as anything is the unwaning optimism of the man who has been named to be the US delegate to the conference—The Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University.

"We can really do this one," insists Father Hesburgh, "By the year 2000 we can solve the problem of hunger and many of the problems of poverty. We couldn't do it before, but we can now—just as long as we don't forget that education is the key."

—Anne Roark (The author is an assistant editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*)

Science & Government Report International Almanac

Pre-publication orders, at a substantially reduced price, are now being accepted for the new edition of SGR International Almanac. Following upon the first edition, which was published last year, the forthcoming volume will consist of original review articles on science-policy developments in all the industrialized and major developing countries, plus the texts of major science-policy documents issued over the past year. Written by leading science-policy specialists from over 20 countries, SGR International Almanac has won wide acclaim as a standard text in its field.

SGR International Almanac is "a needed book for all those who want a broad picture of science policy" — H. Guyford Stever, Director, National Science Foundation, 1972-76.

The SGR Almanac "is indispensable to any serious student of science policy" — Edward E. David Jr., White House Science Adviser, 1970-73, currently President of the AAAS and President of Exxon Research and Engineering Corp.

Publication is scheduled for June 1979, at which time the price per copy will be $75.

Pre-publication orders are now being accepted at $54 per copy, or, in combination with the first edition, at $85 for the two volumes.

SGR International Almanac
PO Box 6226
Washington, DC 20015

Please enter my order for:

☐ The 1979 edition of SGR International Almanac at the reduced price of $54 per copy.

☐ The 1979 edition, in combination with the previous edition, at the reduced combination price of $85.

☐ check enclosed ☐ please bill

Name _____

Address _____ Zip _____

Please make checks payable to SGR International Almanac

If not satisfied, a full refund will be made upon return of your purchase.

At Last, a Human Rights Peep from UK Scientists

London. Just before the strikebound London *Times* disappeared from the newsstands, it published a letter from 17 British scientists who said they would be boycotting the December laser-plasma interactions meeting in Moscow. The scientists, mostly physicists from universities, said their action was "in protest at the recent violations of human rights in the Soviet Union."

British researchers have made few public statements on the plight of dissident scientists in the USSR. Unlike the US National Academy of Sciences, Britain's Royal Society has done little to bring the issue out in to the open, or even to encourage discussion within the scientific community. Instead it prefers to make behind-the-scenes approaches to its Soviet equivalent when it wants to plead the case of a dissident scientist. And any intervention that takes place is usually reserved for purely scientific matters, where, for example, a researcher is not allowed to take up a temporary post abroad, rather than something as vague as "violations of human rights."

The *Times* letter came just before publication was halted so there was no opportunity for the usual debate to take place in the paper's correspondence columns. However, it is not likely that there would have been a rejoinder from scientists who, for one reason or another, do not favor the boycott method. (A small team did go to the Moscow meeting, but some of these were government employees who are restrained from entering the debate.)

Even those scientists who disagreed with the tactics advocated by the *Times* letter agree that dissident scientists are badly treated in the USSR. However, they say, they prefer to visit the USSR and to make their views known through personal contacts with the Soviet scientific hierarchy.

The episode of the *Times* letter isn't likely to split the scientific establishment in the UK, since British scientists rarely take up positions that they are prepared to defend so passionately that they come into conflict with their colleagues. But there were one or two less than gentlemanly comments made privately. For example, one scientists who did not agree with the boycott was quick to point out that few of those who signed the letter would actually have gone to the Moscow meeting.

And one signatory admitted that because he had just returned from a similar meeting in the US, he would have had great difficulty in finding the funds needed to make the trip to Moscow. That the Soviet Union may have read the letter and decided to respond in its own way is possible. One of the scientists who went to the meeting did not receive his entry visa for the USSR until the last minute, and he half-jokingly suggested that this may have been a been a result of the appearance of the letter.—MK

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106